

MINUTES OF TTF CG MEETING

To: Distribution

From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia Telecommunications

A meeting of the Telecommunications Transmission Facility Coordinating Group (TTF CG) was held on March 12, 2003. The following people were in attendance:

MEMBERS

Jane Lawton OCA (240) 777-3724

Kathy Reilly M-NCPPC (301) 495-4555

Pat Hanehan MCPS (301) 279-3609

Melanie Coffin OMB (240) 777-2763

David Niblock DPS (240) 777-6252

STAFF

Margie Williams OCA (240) 777-3762

Robert Hunnicutt CTC (410) 964-5700

Kamal Johari CTC (410) 964-5700

OTHER ATTENDEES

Jim Michal Jackson & Campbell

M.G. Diamond for Verizon Wireless

Henri Edoh Sprint PCS

Bill O'Brien T-Mobile

Discussion Item: Jane Lawton noted that this was the first meeting of the group since November, and that a number of times since then, the applications had been acted upon via electronic messages. She stated that she hoped everyone was comfortable with that process, as she believed it was an efficient method of conducting meetings when there was no discussion about the applications being reviewed. She also noted that there had not been any meetings for the past two months, and consequently, there were no minutes for approval.

Consent Agenda:

1. T-Mobile application to replace 6 existing antennas with 6 new antennas at the 180' level of an existing 180' monopole on the Burtonsville VFD property located at 15430 Old Columbia Pike in Burtonsville (Application #200302-02).

Bob Hunnicutt stated that the first application was a consent item for T-Mobile, which was for an equipment upgrade similar to other previous applications they had submitted for review. Jane Lawton asked if there was any discussion regarding this application.

Kathy Reilly asked if this monopole had originally been approved by Special Exception, noting that she had been unable to find any record for this site in the Park and Planning files.

Jim Michal stated that he had been involved with this site for the initial construction of the monopole, which was permitted by right, and that it is on the private property of the Fire Department. Bob Hunnicutt referred the group to the tower database, and noted that the first applications for co-location reviewed at this site were in May and June of 1997, with no action prior to that time, so he concluded this facility was constructed prior to the formation of the TTF CG.

Motion: Dave Niblock moved the application be recommended for approval. Pat Hanehan seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to construct a new 120' monopole at the Rock Creek Village Shopping

Center located at 5504 Norbeck Road in Rockville (Application #200302-01).

Kamal Johari summarized the Tower Coordinator's review of the RF propagation maps submitted with the application.

Mr. Johari also stated that the TTFCG had approved an application by Sprint in 1996 for a monopole on County property on Bauer Drive, across the street from this site. When asked about the status of that site, Sprint representatives had stated they were no longer pursuing it because they were unable to obtain a lease agreement with the County. He added that Sprint had also looked at the Crown monopole at Red Gate Golf Course in the Rockville City limits as a possible site for co-location.

Mr. Johari stated that the RF propagation maps submitted with this application showed coverage to the north, west, and south, but a slight gap in service to the southeast near Arctic Avenue. He added that reducing the height of this monopole would only serve to widen those gaps in coverage.

He stated that Sprint also submitted an RF propagation map for the Crown monopole at the Red Gate Golf Course, approximately three-quarters of a mile away in the City of Rockville. Based on our review of the RF map, it appears that if Sprint uses that site, the very small gaps to the southeast would likely widen. Thus, the shopping center is a somewhat better location, based on the coverage illustrated on the RF map.

Bob Hunnicutt reported that upon checking with the City of Rockville, City staff reported that Sprint had been negotiating an attachment on the Red Gate monopole for quite some time, but in the end, declined to sign a lease agreement.

Mr. Hunnicutt stated that on reviewing the site plan, he noticed there was a limited amount of available ground space for additional equipment. He stated that he had asked Sprint where other future carriers would locate their equipment. He said Sprint representatives told him that only the structure needed to be able to accommodate additional carriers, and that there was no requirement for additional space on the ground for the other carriers' equipment. Mr. Hunnicutt stated that, from an engineering perspective, antennas on a monopole would be quite useless without ground equipment, and he believed that an integral part of the Tower Coordinator's review was to be able to conclude that the site would accommodate three carriers' antennas and equipment. He stated that the zoning ordinance also requires that the site plan show that the ground space can accommodate equipment for all three carriers. He added that based on his site survey, it appears there may be ground space limitations due to the existing use of the ground space. He noted that the area designated for use by Sprint was a small grassy area at the end of a sidewalk. He stated that the sidewalk is behind the rear entrances to stores in the shopping center, and the area beyond the grassy space is a designated loading zone with entrances to the rear of the stores. He stated that it appeared that space for equipment would be problematic. He also noted that there was an existing sewer manhole where additional equipment might need to be located.

Mr. Hunnicutt reported that he drove in the neighborhoods around the site, and it appeared that the monopole would be visible from the houses along Route 28 in the subdivision across the street from the shopping center. He added that there are a large number of condominiums on the other side of the property where the top of the monopole would be plainly visible from the rear balconies of many of those condominiums.

Jane Lawton asked why the Bauer Drive site had not been used by Sprint. Jim Michal replied that early on in the process of providing service to this area, Sprint's emphasis was to provide coverage to the north, including the Red Gate Golf Course, but that over time, Sprint's network had changed as had their coverage requirements. Ms. Lawton asked if the Bauer Drive site would still provide the coverage desired by Sprint. Kamal Johari stated that no RF propagation maps had been provided with this application for comparison purposes, but he believed it would still work because the sites are directly across the street from each other. After checking with Sprint's engineer, Jim Michal agreed that the Bauer Drive site would also provide the desired coverage.

Jane Lawton stated she would need to see more information as to why the Bauer Drive site, which the TTFCG has already approved, would not work for Sprint in lieu of this site.

Ms. Lawton asked why Sprint did not request a waiver to construct this monopole only for Sprint's equipment, since it appears there may be some site issues regarding ground space for additional equipment. Jim Michal

stated that it is not necessary for Sprint to lease additional ground space in order to obtain a Special Exception for this monopole. He stated he believed that other carriers wishing to co-locate on this facility could negotiate their own lease with the landlord, and believed that should be sufficient for meeting the equipment space requirements. He added that the landlord had indicated a willingness to enter into agreements with other carriers and would work out placement of their equipment. He added that he intended to obtain a letter from the landlord to that effect for the Special Exception hearing, but he did not believe this was an issue of concern for the TTF CG. He also suggested that if there was a problem with using additional ground space, platforms could be constructed above the Sprint equipment for installing the equipment cabinets of additional carriers

Pat Hanehan asked if the additional cabinets or shelters could be placed on the roof of the adjacent building. Bob Hunnicutt replied that he did not know the structural characteristics of the building, and no information had been submitted regarding that option.

Jane Lawton stated she believed it was necessary for Sprint to address the issue of equipment space for future carriers. She suggested that the group could table this application and wait for additional information from Sprint regarding this matter.

Pat Hanehan said he would be interested in seeing a note from the landlord. Bob Hunnicutt stated that because the regulation states the ground space must be available for additional carriers, in order for him to assert that the site could accommodate three carriers, he would need to see elevation profiles and a site plan that show exactly where additional equipment is proposed to be located before he could recommend this application to the group. Kathy Reilly agreed that it was very clear that the zoning ordinance requires space on the ground for all three carriers on the monopole, and she did not believe that the M-NCPPC staff would support anything less than that. She added that stacking equipment might be a problem because of adequate screening of the site, an issue which the M-NCPPC would also probably not support.

Melanie Coffin stated that she used to live in those condominiums, and she knew that the ground space at the rear of the grocery store where this monopole is proposed to be sited is not visible from the surrounding neighbors, and that she did not believe stacking the equipment would be a matter of concern. Bob Hunnicutt agreed with Ms. Coffin, and stated that the location of Sprint's equipment was in an area that was also blocked from adjacent views by the building.

Jim Michal stated that they stacked equipment at the Colesville Shopping Center site with no objections from the surrounding community. Kamal Johari stated that it is possible to stack one set of equipment but it may be difficult to stack a second or third set because of the space limitations. Bob Hunnicutt added that the only place that the TTF CG had approved stacking equipment was at the Public Service Training Academy.

Motion: Pat Hanehan moved that the application be tabled. Melanie Coffin seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Discussion Item - Legislative Update: Jane Lawton noted that the Executive Regulation was being prepared, reviewed, and approved in two parts. The first part related to establishing the categories for the fees, and the second part related to establishing the actual fees. She stated that the categories had gone to the MFP work session the prior week and was slated for Council review on March 25. She noted that some carriers were present at the work session and had objected to some of the wording in the application. She noted that she had not been at that meeting, and asked Marjorie Williams to relate what the issues had been.

Marjorie distributed copies of the Executive Regulation and stated that the carriers had objected to the reference requiring FAA approval as part of their TTF CG application. She stated that the carriers had noted that the requirements for balloon tests and photo simulations were usually provided during the Special Exception hearing, not at the TTF CG review.

Jane Lawton stated that she had spoken with Marilyn Praisner and Cliff Royalty, and they were revising the Executive Regulation and its attached TTF CG application to more accurately reflect the intent of the Executive and the Council regarding this matter.

Mr. Hunnicutt added that during discussions of the zoning text changes, certain items were thought to be more appropriate for zoning text amendments and others more appropriate for the Executive Regulation. At the

initial stage of drafting the Executive Regulation, these were requirements that were deemed more appropriate for the Executive Regulation than the zoning text; consequently, the application had been revised to include those requirements. He stated that the carriers' position on these matters had been discussed at two previous TTFCG meetings.

M.G. Diamond stated that the requirements for facilities to be at least 1,500 feet from other towers had been deleted from the final zoning text amendment, and so should also be removed from the Executive Regulation and application as well. Jane Lawton and Bob Hunnicutt agreed and said that they would recommend that revision.

Jane Lawton stated that staff would work with changes for review by the Executive Branch, and would then begin the process of setting the fees. She stated that she believed that the process would take approximately thirty days to complete.

The next meeting of the TTFCG is scheduled for Wednesday, April 16, 2002 at 10:00 a.m. in the 2nd floor conference room #225 of the COB.